

DRC

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

REPORT

Division: Engineering

Member: Tim Welch
Engineering Design Mgr.
Office Ph. 954-828-5123
Office Fax: 954-828-5275
Email: timw@cityfort.com

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs

Case #: 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Request: This application consists of a request to reduce the required parking of 69.482 (or 70) to 57 spaces, a 13 space reduction.

Comments:

1. The parking reduction methodology and analysis will be reviewed by the City staff and the City's traffic and parking consulting firm, Tinter Associates, Inc.
2. The staff's and the City's consultant's comments must be effectively resolved prior to authorizing the case for Planning & Zoning Board hearing.
3. It appears that there may be obstructions for some spaces where certain blocked out areas are found (and one sign base appear to hinder adequate dimensions for counted parking spaces). The application should elaborate with appropriate notes resolving or explaining that these apparent encroachments into the parking spaces would not hinder their efficient use.
4. We count only 56 spaces on sheet A1.01. Please verify the accuracy of the "Site Tabulations Table" representing 57 total spaces when apparently only 56 are available.
5. The applicant's consultant submitted methodology utilizing the FDOT's 2002 *Peak Season Category Factors Report* since no apparent data was available from the currently operating businesses in the shopping center. The City's consultant will need to evaluate the appropriateness of this source for adjusting the parking demands for seasonal impacts.
6. Page 4 of the analysis and the Tables provided outline use of the ULI Shared Parking analysis for determination of parking requirements based on the understanding that multiple uses can exhibit peaks at different times. Exhibit 28 of ULI is included as an appendix to this document. However, it is not readily evident how the applicant's consultant calculates the "Total New

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Demand” column in Tables 1 – 3. Please include an example which demonstrates how the consultant calculates this value (say for the peak time period which will be our most interesting value).

7. Why does the data collection paragraph mention a health and fitness use (The Ladies Workout Express) but not list that parking demand as a separate use in the Site Tabulations list on Sheet A1.01. This result is interesting considering it would have the second highest parking demand factor on this site at 1 space/200 gfa.
8. The report indicates Table 2 represents data from Saturday, September 6, 2003 but the “Occupied Spaces” column footnote (in Table 2) references September 5, 2003, when Table 1 data is supposedly retrieved. Please explain which reference is correct?

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Fire

Member: Albert Weber
954-828-5875

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs

Case #: 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. No Comments

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Info. Systems

Member: Mark Pallans
(GRG)
954-828-5790

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs

Case #: 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. No apparent interference will result from this plan at this time.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Landscape

Member: Dave Gennaro
954-828-5200

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs

Case #: 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Verify applicable Landscape Code requirements for this site. If a vehicular use area was constructed prior to 1977, a permit for Retroactive Vehicular Use Area Landscape Code compliance is required. Permit research was unable to locate any Code compliance permits. Retroactive VUA Code is ½ of current Code (as a min.) to the point where there would be a loss of required parking. If a permit is required, it must be issued within 30 days. Otherwise, landscape maintenance requirements may apply.

Recommendations:

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division:	Planning	Member:	Mark McConnell 954-828-8981
Project Name:	Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs	Case #:	83-R-03
Date:	October 14, 2003		

Comments:

1. A Parking Reduction request requires Site Plan Level III review. Separate application and fee is required for Planning and Zoning Board submittal. Parking reductions are subject to City Commission Request for Review.
2. Confirm with Engineering representative whether applicant discussed methodology for study prior to preparing study and if information is sufficient. Also, whether the applicant's study will need to be reviewed by one of the City's traffic consultants.
3. The applicant must submit documentation that the Parking Division (Parking Manager or his representative) concurs with the study submitted.
4. Submit a point-by-point narrative outlining compliance with Section 47-24.2 (Adequacy Requirements). This is required for Parking Reductions
5. Pursuant to Section 47-20.3 Reductions and Exemptions, the narrative must clearly state which criteria they are applying.
6. Should the application for a Parking Reduction be approved, a parking reduction order must be executed and recorded in the public records of Broward County at the applicant's expense. This must be done prior to Final DRC approval.
7. Please discuss with Zoning, Engineering and Landscaping any issues that may need to be brought up to existing code.
8. It is recommended that the applicant contact the Knoll Ridge HOA and inform them of this proposal.
9. Expand the information in the title block to clearly state that this plan is for a Jersey Mike's Sub Shop, requesting 10, 4-seat tables to an existing take out restaurant, requiring a parking reduction (otherwise, the purpose of this plan is unknown).

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

10. Information implies the business exists. A field visit on October 6 revealed the business is not yet open. Is there an approval and/or permit for the Jersey Mike's to conduct business as a take-out only restaurant? If so, please provide dates and/or permit number.
11. The east elevation on plan sheet A3.01 does not match that observed in the field. First, the elevation labels the roof as asphalt, but exhibits a barrel tile texture. Secondly, the slanted tin roof observed in the field is not shown, nor is the space allocated for the individual business signs. The elevation must be consistent with the field observations.
12. The 5 to 6-foot Kopsia along the front of the site was not observed in the field.
13. The plan shows 2 Sabal Palms; only one was located in the field.
14. The parking study and the site plan both list the area of the restaurant as 1,700 SF, but the application form states 1675 SF. Please make all information consistent and adjust all plan information where appropriate.
15. It is noted that there is no on-site lighting; lighting provided to the site is from the interiors of the stores and the public street lights along Federal Highway.
16. The parking study mentioned a parking space that is under-sized near the dry cleaners. Please identify the space on the plan and in the parking study, and note with dimensions the actual space size.
17. When all factors were combined and considered (ie., seasonal growth, 10% turnover, and additional parking spaces to serve Jersey Mike's), a total of 53 spaces were needed during the highest peak hour (6 PM on Friday). The overall site provides for 57 total spaces, but only 32 are located out front. The remaining 25 spaces are located to the rear. This presents an issue because:
 - a. There is no pedestrian connection from the rear spaces to allow patrons to park out back, and then walk to the business entrances along the front.
 - b. There is no vehicular connection of the rear spaces to the front spaces.
 - c. Unless there is some way for patrons to access these business from the rear spaces, they essentially are convenient only for the employees of these businesses, and should not be credited toward the number needed for this center.
18. The 8.5 X 11 Land Use Map does not include a label to specify the adopted land use plan designation for this particular area. Please add a label.
19. Additional comments may be forthcoming at the DRC meeting.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Police **Member:** Det. C. Cleary- Robitaille
(954) 828-6419

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs **Case #:** 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Impact resistant material should be used for all glazed areas. If existing glass is to remain, polyester film, at least 8 mils thick, should be placed over all glass areas.
2. A perimeter alarm system, accompanied by a glass- breaking sensor system, should be installed.
3. An internal alarm system should include a panic alert as well as a tamper switch for the safe.
4. The rear exterior door should be metal, encased in a steel frame, and should have a peephole that allows a viewing angle of at least 180 degrees.
5. CCTV is recommended for the following areas: Front door, rear door, cash register area, and office. This will not only deter armed robberies and burglaries, but will prevent employee theft.
6. Parking lot lighting should meet the standards set by IESNA.
7. Landscaping should not interfere with exterior lighting.

Recommendations

1. Due to the high volume of building that is going on in the city it is impossible for the Fort Lauderdale Police Department to provide adequate security at all construction sites. It is highly recommended that the managing company make arrangements for private security.

Please submit comments in writing prior to DRC sign-off.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Zoning

Member: Terry Burgess
954-828-5913

Project Name: Ira Lang/Jersey Mike's Subs

Case #: 83-R-03

Date: October 14, 2003

Comments:

1. Dimension all parking spaces and drive aisles on the site plan.
2. Provide a parking data table breaking down the parking requirement for each use and the total required parking spaces and the number provided.
3. Additional comments may be forthcoming at the DRC meeting.